

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21, 32-28 and 41-50 were presented for examination. In an Office action dated April 1, 2008, claims 1-17, 32 and 41-50 were rejected. Claims 18-21 and 33-38 were allowed. Claims 22-31, 39 and 40 have been canceled. Claims 1, 32, 41, 42 and 43 are amended herein to more distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 2**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17, 32, 41 and 42 under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 as allegedly not specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 32 to recite "a multimedia printer for outputting a document." Applicants have also amended claim 41 to recite "a memory for storing processed multimedia data." Similarly, Applicant have amended claim 42 to recite "an output system for outputting the multimedia data," and have amended claim 43 to recite "the output system for outputting data in a plurality of formats." The amendments made to the claim language now specifically recite that the devices are not only capable of doing something, but actually doing the recited action.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claims 1-17, 32 and 41-50 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them. In the event that the Examiner maintains the rejections, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter this amendment in order to present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal pursuant to MPEP 2272.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Date: <u>May 22, 2008</u>	By: <u>Respectfully Submitted, JONATHAN HULL, et al. /Kanda Ishihara/</u>
	Kanda Ishihara, Attorney of Record Registration No. 56,607 FENWICK & WEST LLP 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 Phone: (650) 335-7805 Fax: (650) 938-5200 Email: kishihara@fenwick.com